arXiv:1605.09614v2 [math.PR] 7 Mar 2017

Optimal Dividend Payout Model with Risk Sensitive Preferences

Nicole Bäuerle [a], **Anna Jaśkiewicz**[b]

[a]Department of Mathematics, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, Karlsruhe, Germany *email: nicole.baeuerle@kit.edu*

[b]Faculty of Pure and Applied Mathematics, Wrocław University of Science and Technology, Wrocław, Poland *email: anna.jaskiewicz@pwr.edu.pl*

Abstract. We consider a discrete-time dividend payout problem with risk sensitive shareholders. It is assumed that they are equipped with a risk aversion coefficient and construct their discounted payoff with the help of the exponential premium principle. This leads to a risk adjusted discounted cash flow of dividends. Within such a framework not only the expected value of the dividends is taken into account but also their variability. Our approach is motivated by a remark in Gerber and Shiu (2004). We deal with the finite and infinite time horizon problems and prove that, even in this general setting, the optimal dividend policy is a band policy. We also show that the policy improvement algorithm can be used to obtain the optimal policy and the corresponding value function. Next, an explicit example is provided, in which the optimal policy is shown to be of a barrier type. Finally, we present some numerical studies and discuss the influence of the risk sensitive parameter on the optimal dividend policy.

Keywords. Dividend payout problem; Risk sensitive preferences; Bellman equation; Band policy; Policy improvement algorithm.

1. Introduction

The dividend payout model in risk theory is a classical problem that was introduced by de Finetti (1957). Since then there have been various extensions. The goal is to find for the free surplus process of an insurance company, a dividend payout strategy that maximises the expected discounted dividends until ruin. Typical models for the surplus process are compound Poisson processes, diffusion processes, general renewal processes or discrete time processes. The reader is referred to Albrecher and Thonhauser (2009) and Avanzi (2009), where excellent overviews of recent results are provided.

Up to now most of the research has been done for the risk neutral perspective, where the expected discounted dividends until ruin are considered. Obviously this criterion does not take the variability of the dividends into account. From the shareholders' perspective or from an economic point of view it would be certainly desirable to reduce the variability of the dividends. Risk should be incorporated in any kind of economic decision and shareholders are in general risk averse. In Gerber and Shiu (2004) the authors propose the problem of maximising the expected *utility* of discounted dividends until ruin instead. Such a criterion is able to model risk aversion. In Grandits et al. (2007) the authors

consider the dividend problem with an exponential utility in a diffusion setting. They show under some assumptions that there is a time dependent optimal barrier. Bäuerle and Jaśkiewicz (2015) consider a discrete time setting and prove the optimality of a band policy for the exponential utility and partly characterise the optimal dividend policy in a power utility setting. To the best of our knowledge these are so far the only papers dealing with risk sensitive dividend problems.

In this paper, we treat now the discrete time setting with state space $\mathbb{R}_+$ like in Albrecher et al. (2011) and Socha (2014). However, we propose a new approach, where we consider risk sensitive preferences. Namely, the risk adjusted discounted cash flow of the shareholder is now of the form

$$V_t = \alpha_t + M(V_{t+1}), \quad \text{where} \quad M(V_{t+1}) = -\frac{\beta}{\gamma} \ln\left(\mathbb{E}_t e^{-\gamma V_{t+1}}\right),$$

α_t is the dividend paid at time t, $\beta \in (0,1)$ is a discount factor, $\gamma > 0$ is the risk sensitive parameter and V_t is the risk adjusted discounted cash flow of dividends from time t onwards. These preferences are not time additive in the future dividends anymore and allow to model risk aversion. Note that we are here concerned about the variability of each dividend paid. This is in contrast to Grandits et al. (2007) and Bäuerle and Jaśkiewicz (2015), where the utility of the total discounted dividends is considered. For the exponential utility with discount factor 1 both approaches are equivalent.

The risk sensitive preferences considered in this paper belong to a wider class of recursive preferences studied extensively in macroeconomics and finance. They enjoys attention, because they allow to disentangle risk attitudes from intertemporal substitution. In particular, Epstein and Zin (1989) and Weil (1990) motivated the use of the certainty equivalent M. Its concavity (see footnote in Sect. 2) would amplify risk aversion above intertemporal substitution. Furthermore, the concavity of M would cause the agent to prefer the early resolution of uncertainty (see Kreps and Porteus (1978)). The aforementioned recursive preference functional is still analytically tractable and retains the main behaviour features of the risk neutral case with M replaced by the expectation operator. One of the first papers on optimal control with this risk adjusted certainty equivalent in discrete time is Hansen and Sargent (1995). It considers special LQ-problems. In recent years there is a growing number of papers that study various model aspects with risk adjusted certainty equivalent, see Anderson (2005); Ozaki and Streufert (1996); Tallarini (2000); Weil (1993).

Our model can be viewed as a Markov decision process with specific transition probability and payoff functions. Therefore, it is worth mentioning that Markov decision processes with dynamic risk maps and discounted costs were examined by Ruszczyński (2010). However, his results do not imply ours, since he studied bounded cost functions and coherent risk measures. In particular, such a risk measure must be positively homogeneous. Further, Shen st al. (2013) generalise the paper of Ruszczyński (2010) to unbounded gains and the risk sensitive average reward case. However, in their approach they apply the weighted norm approach, which result in rather stringent assumptions. Moreover, they do not analyse the properties of an optimal policy. This analysis, in our

case, is necessary to show that the optimal policy has a band structure. Bäuerle and Rieder (2014) considered general certainty equivalents for the accumulated discounted payoffs. All the aforementioned papers deal with Bellman equations and discuss existence and uniqueness of solutions as well as optimal policies. However, their results are not helpful in our special setting.

The main contributions of our paper is threefold. First we are able to give a mathematically rigorous solution technique for these risk sensitive dividend problems over a finite and an infinite time horizon. More precisely, we formulate a Bellman equation which allows to compute the value function over a finite time horizon. We also show that these value functions monotonically approximate the value function of the infinite horizon problem. The infinite horizon value function is also characterised as a fixed point of an operator on a certain set of functions. Second we prove that a stationary optimal policy has a band structure. Hence, even in this more complicated risk sensitive setting, we are able to confirm the same form of optimal dividend payout strategy as in the risk neutral case (for the risk neutral model consult, e.g., Miyasawa (1962), Morrill (1966), Gerber (1974), Borch (1982)). Third we show that the policy improvement algorithm is another feasible way to compute the value function and the optimal dividend payout policy for the infinite time horizon. Finally, we give some numerical examples that shed some light on the optimal policy. For a risk sensitive model with left-sided exponential distribution for the increments of the risk reserve, we show under some assumptions on the parameters that a barrier policy is optimal. This result generalises Socha (2014). For a risk sensitive model with double-exponential distribution for the increments of the risk reserve, we compute the optimal policy for time horizon three explicitly. We can see some surprising dependence of the barrier on the risk sensitive parameter.

The paper is organised as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the model and our notation. The finite horizon problem is then considered in Section 3 and the limit to the infinite horizon is discussed in Section 4. In Section 5, we characterise the value function as the unique fixed point of some operator within a certain class of functions. Next we show in Section 6 that an optimal dividend policy in this risk sensitive setting is a band policy. Afterwards we prove the validity of the policy improvement algorithm in this risk sensitive case. In Section 8 we consider an example with left-sided exponential distribution for the increments of the risk reserve and show that a barrier policy is optimal. In the last section we provide two examples, where we compute the optimal risk sensitive dividend payout over a time horizon of three and discuss the influence of the risk sensitive parameter on an optimal policy.

2. The Model

We consider the classical dividend payout problem with risk sensitive recursive evaluation of the dividends, which are paid at discrete times, say $n \in \mathbb{N} := 1, 2, \ldots$. Assume there is an initial surplus x_1 and usually $x_1 = x \in \mathbb{R}_+ := [0, +\infty)$. Let Z_n be the difference between premium income and claim size in the n-th time interval and assume that $Z_1, Z_2, \ldots$ are independent and identically distributed random variables with distribution

ν on $\mathbb{R}$. At the beginning of each time interval the insurer can decide upon paying a dividend. The dividend payment at time n is denoted by a_n. If the current risk reserve at time $n \in \mathbb{N}$, say x_n, is non-negative, then a_n has to be non-negative and less or equal to x_n. If $x_n < 0$, then the company is ruined and no further dividend can be paid. Hence, the set of admissible dividends is $\mathbb{A}(x_n) := [0, x_n]$, if $x_n \geq 0$ and $\mathbb{A}(x_n) := \{0\}$, if $x_n < 0$. The evolution of the surplus is given by the following equation $X_{n+1} := f(x_n, a_n, Z_n)$, where

$$f(x_n, a_n, Z_n) := \begin{cases} x_n - a_n + Z_n, & \text{if } x_n \geq 0 \\ x_n, & \text{if } x_n < 0. \end{cases}$$

For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, by H_n we denote the set of all feasible histories of the process up to time n, i.e.,

$$h_n := \begin{cases} x_1, & \text{if } n = 1 \\ (x_1, a_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n), & \text{if } n \geq 2, \end{cases}$$

where $a_k \in \mathbb{A}(x_k)$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$. A *dividend policy* $\pi = (\pi_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of Borel measurable decision rules $\pi_n : H_n \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$ such that $\pi_n(h_n) \in \mathbb{A}(x_n)$. Let Λ be the set of all real-valued Borel measurable mappings such that $\alpha(x) \in \mathbb{A}(x)$ for every $x \in \mathbb{R}$. A policy $\pi = (\pi_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is called Markov, if $\pi_n(h_n) = \alpha_n(x_n)$ for some $\alpha_n \in \Lambda$, every $h_n \in H_n$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. A Markov policy is stationary, if $\alpha_n = \alpha$ for some $\alpha \in \Lambda$ and all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. In this case, we write $\pi = \alpha^\infty$. The sets of all policies, all Markov policies, all stationary policies are denoted by Π, Π^M and Π^S, respectively.

Ruin occurs as soon as the surplus gets negative. The epoch τ of ruin is defined as the smallest positive integer n such that $x_n < 0$. The question arises as to how the risk sensitive insurance company will choose its dividend strategy to maximise the gain of the shareholder. In this paper, we shall consider the risk adjusted discounted cash flow of dividends in the finite and infinite time horizon, derived with the aid of the *entropic risk measure* also known as the *exponential premium principle.*

Let X be a non-negative real-valued random variable with distribution μ defined on some probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. The entropic risk measure ρ for X is defined as follows

$$\rho(X) = -\frac{1}{\gamma} \ln\Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}_+} e^{-\gamma x} \mu(dx) \Big),$$

where $\gamma > 0$ is a *risk sensitivity parameter* known also as a risk coefficient. Let Y be also a non-negative random variable defined on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. The following properties of ρ[1] are important and frequently used in our analysis:

(P1) monotonicity, i.e., if $X \leq Y \Rightarrow \rho(X) \leq \rho(Y)$,
(P2) translation invariance, i.e., $\rho(X + x) = \rho(X) + x$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$,
(P3) the Jensen inequality, i.e., $\rho(X) \leq \mathbb{E}X$.

[1]Note that ρ is indeed concave, i.e., $\rho(\lambda X + (1-\lambda)Y) \geq \lambda\rho(X) + (1-\lambda)\rho(Y)$ for any $\lambda \in [0, 1]$.

Furthermore, observe that by the Taylor expansions for the exponential and logarithmic functions, we can approximate $\rho(X)$ as follows

$$\rho(X) \approx \mathbb{E}X - \frac{\gamma}{2} VarX,$$

if $\gamma > 0$ is sufficiently close to 0. Therefore, if X is a random payoff, then the agent who evaluates his expected payoff with the aid of the entropic risk measure, is not only concerned about the expected value $\mathbb{E}X$ of the random payoff X, but also about its variance. Further comments on the entropic risk measure can be found in e.g., Föllmer and Schied (2004) and references cited therein. Note that in the actuarial literature this quantity was known earlier as the exponential premium principle (see Gerber (1974)).

Remark 1. Note that ρ can be interpreted as a *certainty equivalent* $\rho(X) = u^{-1}(\mathbb{E}u(X))$ with $u(x) = e^{-\gamma x}$. The exponential utility is the only function which leads to translation-invariance (see Müller (2007)), a property which we use throughout our proofs.

Let Z be a random variable with the distribution ν. Throughout the paper we shall assume that

(A1) $\mathbb{E}Z^+ = \int_0^\infty z\nu(dz) < +\infty$,

(A2) $\nu(-\infty, 0) > 0$,

(A3) ν has a density g with respect to the Lebesgue measure.

Assumption (A2) allows to avoid a trivial case, when the ruin will never occur under any policy $\pi \in \Pi$. We are now going to maximise the risk adjusted discounted cash flow of dividends over a finite time horizon. For $N = 2$ and fixed policy $\pi = (\pi_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \in \Pi$ the corresponding value which has to be maximized is

$$\pi_1(x) + \beta\rho(\pi_2(x, \pi_1(x), X_2)),$$

where $x_1 = x$ and $X_2 = x - \pi_1(x) + Z_1$ is the random risk reserve on the second stage. For $N = 3$ it is

$$\pi_1(x) + \beta\rho\Big(\pi_2(x, \pi_1(x), X_2) + \beta\rho(\pi_3(x, \pi_1(x), X_2, \pi_2(\cdot), X_3))\Big),$$

where $X_3 = X_2 - \pi_2(x, \pi_1(x), X_2) + Z_2$ is the random risk reserve on the third stage. In order to formalise this, it is common to work with operators which we will introduce next. Fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and

$$\bar{b} := \frac{\beta\mathbb{E}Z^+}{1-\beta}. \tag{1}$$

Let us define

$$\begin{aligned} B(H_k) \;:=\; \{v : H_k \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+ \mid v \text{ is Borel measurable}, v(h_k) \le x_k + \bar{b} \text{ for } x \ge 0, \\ v(h_k) = 0 \text{ for } x < 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\pi = (\pi_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \in \Pi$ be an arbitrary policy. For any $v_{k+1} \in B(H_{k+1})$ and given $h_k \in H_k$ we put

$$\rho_{\pi_k,h_k}(v_{k+1}) := -\frac{1}{\gamma}\ln\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-\gamma v_{k+1}(h_k,\pi_k(h_k),f(x_k,\pi_k(h_k),z))}\nu(dz)\right).$$

Hence,

$$\rho_{\pi_k,h_k}(v_{k+1}) = -\frac{1}{\gamma}\ln\left(\int_{\pi_k(h_k)-x_k}^{\infty} e^{-\gamma v_{k+1}(h_k,\pi_k(h_k),x_k-\pi_k(h_k)+z)}\nu(dz) + \nu(-\infty,\pi_k(h_k)-x_k)\right),$$

if $x_k \geq 0$ and $\rho_{\pi_k,h_k}(v_{k+1}) = 0$, if $x_k < 0$. Furthermore, we define the operator L_{π_k} for functions $v_{k+1} \in B(H_{k+1})$ as follows

$$(L_{\pi_k}v_{k+1})(h_k) := \pi_k(h_k) + \beta\rho_{\pi_k,h_k}(v_{k+1}),$$

where $\beta \in (0,1)$ is a discount factor. By property (P1), it follows that L_{π_k} is monotone, i.e.,

$$(L_{\pi_k}v_{k+1})(h_k) \leq (L_{\pi_k}\hat{v}_{k+1})(h_k) \quad \text{if} \quad v_{k+1} \leq \hat{v}_{k+1}, \quad v_{k+1},\hat{v}_{k+1},\in B(H_{k+1}). \tag{2}$$

We shall write Lv instead of (Lv). Moreover, by (P2) for any constant $\hat{b} \in \mathbb{R}_+$ we get that

$$0 \leq L_{\pi_k}(v_{k+1}+\hat{b})(h_k) = L_{\pi_k}v_{k+1}(h_k) + \beta\hat{b} \tag{3}$$

for every $h_k \in H_k$ with $k \in \mathbb{N}$. For any initial income $x_1 = x \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$ we define the N-stage total risk adjusted discounted cash flow of dividends by

$$J_N(x,\pi) := (L_{\pi_1}\circ\ldots\circ L_{\pi_N})\mathbf{0}(x), \tag{4}$$

where $\mathbf{0}$ is a function such that $\mathbf{0}(h_k) \equiv 0$ for every $h_k \in H_k$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Note that we show below that $(L_{\pi_k}\circ\ldots\circ L_{\pi_N})\mathbf{0}(x) \in B(h_k)$, so the iteration is well-defined. Clearly, if $x < 0$, then $J_N(x,\pi) = 0$. For instance, if $N = 2$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$, definition (4) is read as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
J_2(x,\pi) &= (L_{\pi_1}\circ L_{\pi_2})\mathbf{0}(x) = L_{\pi_1}(L_{\pi_2}\mathbf{0})(x)\\
&= \pi_1(x) - \frac{\beta}{\gamma}\ln\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-\gamma L_{\pi_2}\mathbf{0}(x,\pi_1(x),f(x,\pi_1(x),z))}\nu(dz)\right)\\
&= \pi_1(x) - \frac{\beta}{\gamma}\ln\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-\gamma\pi_2(x,\pi_1(x),f(x,\pi_1(x),z))}\nu(dz)\right)\\
&= \pi_1(x) - \frac{\beta}{\gamma}\ln\left(\int_{\pi_1(x)-x}^{\infty} e^{-\gamma\pi_2(x,\pi_1(x),x-\pi_1(x)+z)}\nu(dz) + \nu(-\infty,\pi_1(x)-x)\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Observe that by (P1) and the fact that $\pi_k(h_k) \geq 0$ for all $h_k \in H_k$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, it follows that the sequence $(J_N(x,\pi))_{N\in\mathbb{N}}$ is non-decreasing and bounded from below by 0 for every $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $\pi \in \Pi$. Moreover, for $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $\pi \in \Pi$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds

$$J_N(x,\pi) \leq x + \bar{b}. \tag{5}$$

Indeed, note first that $L_{\pi_N}\mathbf{0}(h_N) = \pi_N(h_N) \leq x_N + \bar{b}$ for $h_N \in H_N$ with $x_N \geq 0$ and $L_{\pi_N}\mathbf{0}(h_N) = 0$, if $x_N < 0$. If $x_{N-1} \geq 0$, then making use of (3), (P3) and (A1) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&L_{\pi_{N-1}}(L_{\pi_N}\mathbf{0})(h_{N-1}) \\
&\leq \pi_{N-1}(h_{N-1}) + \beta\bar{b} - \frac{\beta}{\gamma}\ln\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-\gamma f(x_{N-1},\pi_{N-1}(h_{N-1}),z)}\nu(dz)\right) \\
&\leq \pi_{N-1}(h_{N-1}) + \beta\bar{b} + \beta\int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x_{N-1},\pi_{N-1}(h_{N-1}),z)\nu(dz) \\
&\leq \pi_{N-1}(h_{N-1}) + \beta\bar{b} + \beta(x_{N-1} - \pi_{N-1}(h_{N-1})) + \beta\int_0^\infty z\nu(dz) \\
&\leq \sup_{a\in[0,x_{N-1}]}(a + \beta(x_{N-1} - a)) + \beta\bar{b} + \beta\mathbb{E}Z^+ = x_{N-1} + \bar{b}.
\end{aligned}$$

If, on the other hand, $x_{N-1} < 0$, then $x_N = x_{N-1}$ and $L_{\pi_{N-1}}(L_{\pi_N}\mathbf{0})(h_{N-1}) = 0$. Continuing this procedure and applying (4), we get the conclusion. By the above discussion, $\lim_{N\to\infty} J_N(x,\pi)$ exists for every $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $\pi \in \Pi$.

For an initial level of the risk reserve $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and a policy $\pi \in \Pi$, we define the risk adjusted discounted cash flow of dividends in the infinite time horizon as follows

$$J(x,\pi) := \lim_{N\to\infty} J_N(x,\pi). \tag{6}$$

The aim of the insurance company is to find an optimal value (the so-called value function) of the risk adjusted discounted cash flow of dividends in the finite and infinite time horizon, i.e.,

$$J_N(x) := \sup_{\pi\in\Pi} J_N(x,\pi) \quad \text{for } N \in \mathbb{N}, \text{ and} \quad J(x) := \sup_{\pi\in\Pi} J(x,\pi)$$

and policies $\pi_*, \pi^* \in \Pi$ for which

$$J_N(x,\pi_*) = J_N(x) \quad \text{for } N \in \mathbb{N}, \text{ and} \quad J(x,\pi^*) = J(x), \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}_+.$$

Remark 2. The parameter γ represents the risk aversion of the shareholders. The larger γ, the more risk averse they are. The limit $\gamma \to 0^+$ leads to the risk neutral case, since

$$-\frac{1}{\gamma}\ln\Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}_+} e^{-\gamma x}\mu(dx)\Big) \to \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} x\mu(dx), \quad \text{for } \gamma \to 0^+.$$

3. The Finite Time Horizon Problem

In this section, we consider the finite time horizon model. With this end in view we fix the time horizon, say $N \in \mathbb{N}$, and by V_n we denote the value function for the problem from period n up to N, where $n = 1, ..., N$, i.e.,

$$V_n(h_n) = \sup_{\pi\in\Pi}(L_{\pi_n} \circ \ldots \circ L_{\pi_N})\mathbf{0}(h_n), \quad h_n \in H_n.$$

Furthermore, for $\bar{b}$ defined in (1), we introduce the set

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{S}_0 \;:=\; &\{v:\mathbb{R}\mapsto\mathbb{R}_+|\; v(x)\le x+\bar{b} \text{ for } x\in\mathbb{R}_+,\\ &\qquad v(x)=0 \text{ for } x<0,\; v \text{ is non-decreasing and continuous on } \mathbb{R}_+\}.\end{aligned}$$

For $v\in\mathcal{S}_0$ we also define the operator T as follows

$$\begin{aligned}Tv(x) \;&:=\; \sup_{a\in[0,x]}\Big\{a-\frac{\beta}{\gamma}\ln\Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-\gamma v(f(x,a,z))}\nu(dz)\Big)\Big\}\\ &=\; \sup_{a\in[0,x]}\Big\{a-\frac{\beta}{\gamma}\ln\Big(\int_{a-x}^{\infty} e^{-\gamma v(x-a+z)}\nu(dz)+\nu(-\infty,a-x)\Big)\Big\},\; x\in\mathbb{R}_+\end{aligned}$$

and

$$Tv(x)=0,\; x<0.$$

Note that every Borel measurable function $v:\mathbb{R}\mapsto\mathbb{R}_+$ such that $v(x)\le x+\bar{b}$ for $x\in\mathbb{R}_+$ and $v(x)=0$ for $x<0$ can be viewed as a function defined on H_k, with $k\in\mathbb{N}$, in the sense that $v(h_k):=v(x_k)$ for every $h_k\in H_k$. Therefore, with a little abuse of notation, for any decision rule $\alpha\in\Lambda$, we shall write

$$L_\alpha v(x)=\alpha(x)-\frac{\beta}{\gamma}\ln\Big(\int_{\alpha(x)-x}^{\infty} e^{-\gamma v(x-\alpha(x)+z)}\nu(dz)+\nu(-\infty,\alpha(x)-x)\Big)\Big\},\; x\in\mathbb{R}_+$$

and

$$L_\alpha v(x)=0,\; x<0.$$

We have the following result.

Lemma 1. *For any $v\in\mathcal{S}_0$ it follows that $Tv\in\mathcal{S}_0$.*

Proof. Assume that $x\in\mathbb{R}_+$. Then, the continuity of Tv on $\mathbb{R}_+$ follows from Theorem 2.4.10 in Bäuerle and Rieder (2011), since $\mathbb{A}(x)$ is compact, $x\mapsto\mathbb{A}(x)$ is continuous and the mapping

$$(x,a)\mapsto\int_{a-x}^{\infty} e^{-\gamma v(x-a+z)}\nu(dz)+\nu(-\infty,a-x)$$

is continuous.

We show next that Tv is non-decreasing. Suppose $0\le x_1<x_2$, then we obtain (since $v\ge 0$):

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{a-x_1}^{\infty} e^{-\gamma v(x_1-a+z)}\nu(dz)+\nu(-\infty,a-x_1)\\ \ge\;&\int_{a-x_1}^{\infty} e^{-\gamma v(x_2-a+z)}\nu(dz)+\nu(-\infty,a-x_1)\\ =\;&\int_{a-x_1}^{\infty} e^{-\gamma v(x_2-a+z)}\nu(dz)+\nu(-\infty,a-x_2)+\int_{a-x_2}^{a-x_1}1\nu(dz)\\ \ge\;&\int_{a-x_1}^{\infty} e^{-\gamma v(x_2-a+z)}\nu(dz)+\nu(-\infty,a-x_2)+\int_{a-x_2}^{a-x_1}e^{-\gamma v(x_2-a+z)}\nu(dz)\\ =\;&\int_{a-x_2}^{\infty} e^{-\gamma v(x_2-a+z)}\nu(dz)+\nu(-\infty,a-x_2).\end{aligned}$$

Taking care of the monotonicity of the logarithm and the minus sign in front, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & a - \frac{\beta}{\gamma} \ln\Big(\int_{a-x_1}^{\infty} e^{-\gamma v(x_1-a+z)} \nu(dz) + \nu(-\infty, a-x_1) \Big) \\ \leq \;& a - \frac{\beta}{\gamma} \ln\Big(\int_{a-x_2}^{\infty} e^{-\gamma v(x_2-a+z)} \nu(dz) + \nu(-\infty, a-x_2) \Big). \end{aligned}$$

The remaining part is a consequence of $[0, x_1] \subset [0, x_2]$.

Finally we prove the upper bound. Setting $u := x - a$ and making use again of (P1), (P3) and (A1), we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} Tv(x) &= \sup_{a\in[0,x]} \Big\{ a - \frac{\beta}{\gamma} \ln\Big(\int_{a-x}^{\infty} e^{-\gamma v(x-a+z)} \nu(dz) + \nu(-\infty, a-x) \Big) \Big\} \\ &= x + \sup_{u\in[0,x]} \Big\{ -u - \frac{\beta}{\gamma} \ln\Big(\int_{-u}^{\infty} e^{-\gamma v(u+z)} \nu(dz) + \nu(-\infty, -u) \Big) \Big\} \\ &\leq x + \sup_{u\in[0,x]} \Big\{ -u - \frac{\beta}{\gamma} \ln\Big(\int_{-u}^{\infty} e^{-\gamma(u+z+\bar{b})} \nu(dz) + e^{-\gamma\bar{b}} \nu(-\infty, -u) \Big) \Big\} \\ &\leq x + \beta\bar{b} + \sup_{u\in[0,x]} \Big\{ -u - \frac{\beta}{\gamma} \ln\Big(\int_{-u}^{\infty} e^{-\gamma(u+z)} \nu(dz) + \nu(-\infty, -u) \Big) \Big\} \\ &\leq x + \beta\bar{b} + \sup_{u\in[0,x]} \Big\{ -u + \beta \int_{-u}^{\infty} (u+z) \nu(dz) \Big\} \\ &\leq x + \beta\bar{b} + \sup_{u\in[0,x]} \Big\{ -u + \beta u + \beta \int_{0}^{\infty} z \nu(dz) \Big\} = x + \bar{b}. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, setting $a := 0$ we also have

$$\begin{aligned} Tv(x) &\geq -\frac{\beta}{\gamma} \ln\Big(\int_{-x}^{\infty} e^{-\gamma v(x+z)} \nu(dz) + \nu(-\infty, -x) \Big) \\ &\geq -\frac{\beta}{\gamma} \ln\Big(\int_{-x}^{\infty} \nu(dz) + \nu(-\infty, -x) \Big) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the assertion is proved. □

The main result of this section proves the value iteration for V_n and states that the optimal dividend policy is Markov for the model with a finite time horizon.

Theorem 1. *For every $n = 1, \ldots, N$ we have that $V_{N-n+1}(h_{N-n+1}) = J_n(x_{N-n+1})$ and there exists $\alpha^*_{N-n+1} \in \Lambda$ such that $J_{n+1} = TJ_n = L_{\alpha^*_{N-n+1}} J_n$, where $J_0 \equiv \mathbf{0}$. In particular, $J_n \in \mathcal{S}_0$ and $J_n(x) \geq x$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $n \geq 1$. Moreover, the policy $\pi_* = (\alpha^*_1, \ldots, \alpha^*_N) \in \Pi^M$ is optimal, i.e., $J_N(x) = J_N(x, \pi_*)$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$.*

PROOF. The proof proceeds by backward induction. Let $h_N = (x_1, \ldots, x_N) \in H_N$. Then, if $x_N \geq 0$ we obtain

$$V_N(h_N) = \sup_{\pi_N}(L_{\pi_N}\mathbf{0})(h_N) = \sup_{a\in[0,x_N]} a = x_N = J_1(x_N) = (TJ_0)(x_N).$$

For $x_N < 0$ we put $J_1(x_N) = 0$. Hence, $J_1 \in \mathcal{S}_0$. Define $\alpha_N^*(x) := x$ for $x \geq 0$ and $\alpha_N^*(x) := 0$ for $x < 0$. Obviously, $\alpha_N^* \in \Lambda$. Now suppose that the statement is true for $k = N, N-1, \ldots, N-n+1$, $(n \in \mathbb{N})$ i.e.,

$$V_{N-n+1}(h_{N-n+1}) = J_n(x_{N-n+1}) = (L_{\alpha^*_{N-n+1}} \circ \ldots \circ L_{\alpha_N^*})\mathbf{0}(h_{N-n+1}), \quad h_{N-n+1} \in H_{N-n+1}.$$

We prove the result for $k = N-n$. Fix a history $h_{N-n} \in H_{N-n}$ and assume that $x_{N-n} \geq 0$. From (2) and our assumption we have

$$\begin{aligned}
V_{N-n}(h_{N-n}) &= \sup_{\pi\in\Pi}(L_{\pi_{N-n}} \circ \ldots \circ L_{\pi_N})\mathbf{0}(h_{N-n}) \\
&\leq \sup_{\pi_{N-n}} (L_{\pi_{N-n}} \circ L_{\alpha^*_{N-n+1}} \circ \ldots \circ L_{\alpha_N^*})\mathbf{0}(h_{N-n}) \\
&= \sup_{\pi_{N-n}} (L_{\pi_{N-n}} V_{N-n+1})(h_{N-n}) \\
&= \sup_{a\in[0,x_{N-n}]} \left\{ a - \frac{\beta}{\gamma} \ln\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-\gamma J_n(f(x_{N-n},a,z))}\nu(dz) \right) \right\} \\
&= (TJ_n)(x_{N-n}) = (L_{\alpha^*_{N-n}} \circ \ldots \circ L_{\alpha_N^*})\mathbf{0}(x_{N-n}) \qquad (7) \\
&\leq J_{n+1}(x_{N-n}) \leq V_{N-n}(h_{N-n}).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have the equality. Since $\mathbb{A}(x)$ is compact and the set-valued mapping $x \mapsto \mathbb{A}(x)$ is continuous, the existence of a maximiser $\alpha^*_{N-n} \in \Lambda$ in (7) follows from, e.g., Proposition 2.4.8 in Bäuerle and Rieder (2011). Assume now that $x_{N-n} < 0$. This means that ruin has happened before or at the epoch $N-n$. Then, $\alpha^*_{N-n}(x_{N-n}) = \ldots = \alpha^*_N(x_N) = 0$, $V_{N-n}(h_{N-n}) = \ldots = V_N(h_N) = 0$ and $x_{N-n} = \ldots = x_N$. From Lemma 1, it follows that $J_{n+1} = TJ_n \in \mathcal{S}_0$. In order to conclude, we put $\pi_* = (\alpha_1^*, \ldots, \alpha_N^*)$. Then, $J_N(x) = J_N(x, \pi_*)$.

Now assume that $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and observe that $J_1(x) \geq x$. Putting $a := x$ we obtain by (P1)

$$\begin{aligned}
J_{n+1} = TJ_n(x) &\geq x - \frac{\beta}{\gamma} \ln\Big(\int_0^\infty e^{-\gamma J_n(z)}\nu(dz) + \nu(-\infty, 0) \Big) \\
&\geq x - \frac{\beta}{\gamma} \ln\Big(\int_0^\infty \nu(dz) + \nu(-\infty, 0) \Big) \geq x.
\end{aligned}$$

This fact finishes the proof. □

Remark 3. For $\gamma \to 0^+$ we obtain the value iteration for the risk neutral insurance company

$$J_{n+1}(x) = \sup_{a\in[0,x]} \Big\{ a + \beta \int_{a-x}^\infty J_n(x-a+z)\nu(dz) \Big\}.$$

4. The Infinite Time Horizon Model

From considerations in Section 2, it follows that the sequence $(J_N(x))_{N\in\mathbb{N}}$ is also non-decreasing. Hence, $J_\infty(x) := \lim_{N\to\infty} J_N(x)$ exists and $x \le J_\infty(x) \le x + \bar{b}$ for every $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$. We arrive at the first result.

Lemma 2. *It holds that $J(x) = J_\infty(x)$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and J is non-decreasing.*

Proof. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $\pi \in \Pi$. Clearly, we have $J_N(x) \ge J_N(x,\pi)$. Letting $N \to \infty$ yields that $J_\infty(x) \ge J(x,\pi)$. Hence, taking the supremum over all policies we obtain $J_\infty(x) \ge J(x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$. On the other hand, for fixed $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $n \ge N$ we get $J_n(x,\pi) \ge J_N(x,\pi)$. Thus, $J(x,\pi) \ge J_N(x,\pi)$, which implies that $J(x) \ge J_N(x)$ and, consequently, $J(x) \ge J_\infty(x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Hence, combining both inequalities together we have that $J(x) = J_\infty(x)$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Since each J_N is non-decreasing, it follows that J is non-decreasing. □

The second result is a simple observation. For any policy $\pi = \alpha^\infty \in \Pi^S$, we shall write $J_\alpha(x)$ instead of $J(x,\alpha^\infty)$ and $J_{N,\alpha}(x)$ instead of $J_N(x,\alpha^\infty)$.

Lemma 3. *Let $\pi = \alpha^\infty \in \Pi^S$. Then, $J_\alpha = L_\alpha J_\alpha$.*

Proof. From the definition of $J_{N,\alpha}$ it can be easily concluded that

$$J_{N,\alpha} = L_\alpha J_{N-1,\alpha} = L_\alpha^N \mathbf{0},$$

where L_α^N is the N-th composition of the operator L_α with itself. Letting $N \to \infty$ on both sides and making use of the monotone convergence theorem, we get the conclusion. □

The next main result provides a characterisation of the value function in the infinite time horizon model. Let us define

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{S} \;:=\; \{v : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+ |\; & x \le v(x) \le x + \bar{b} \text{ for } x \in \mathbb{R}_+, \\ & v(x) = 0 \text{ for } x < 0,\ v \text{ is non-decreasing and continuous on } \mathbb{R}_+\}.\end{aligned}$$

Theorem 2. *The risk sensitive value function J of the dividend problem is the unique fixed point of T in $\mathcal{S}$, i.e.,*

$$J(x) = TJ(x) = \sup_{a\in[0,x]} \Big\{ a - \frac{\beta}{\gamma} \ln\Big(\int_{a-x}^{\infty} e^{-\gamma J(x-a+z)} \nu(dz) + \nu(-\infty, a-x) \Big) \Big\},\ x \in \mathbb{R}_+$$

and $J(x) = 0 = TJ(x)$ for $x < 0$. Moreover, there exists $\alpha^* \in \Lambda$ such that $J = L_{\alpha^*} J$.

PROOF. We start with defining the set

$$\mathcal{B} := \{b : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+|\ b(x) \le \bar{b}, b \text{ is continuous on } \mathbb{R}_+\}.$$

Let $v \in \mathcal{S}$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Then, $v(x)$ can be written as $v(x) = x + b(x)$, where $b \in \mathcal{B}$. Recall that

$$\begin{aligned} Tv(x) &= \sup_{a\in[0,x]} \Big\{ a - \frac{\beta}{\gamma} \ln\Big(\int_{a-x}^{\infty} e^{-\gamma v(x-a+z)} \nu(dz) + \nu(-\infty, a-x)\Big)\Big\} \\ &= x + \sup_{u\in[0,x]} \Big\{ -u - \frac{\beta}{\gamma} \ln\Big(\int_{-u}^{\infty} e^{-\gamma(u+z+b(u+z))} \nu(dz) + \nu(-\infty, -u)\Big)\Big\}. \end{aligned}$$

Defining the operator U on $\mathcal{B}$ as follows

$$Ub(x) := \sup_{u\in[0,x]} \Big\{ -u - \frac{\beta}{\gamma} \ln\Big(\int_{-u}^{\infty} e^{-\gamma(u+z+b(u+z))} \nu(dz) + \nu(-\infty, -u)\Big)\Big\}, \tag{8}$$

we obtain that $Tv(x) = x + Ub(x)$. We claim that $U : \mathcal{B} \mapsto \mathcal{B}$. Indeed, by (P3) for $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$

$$\begin{aligned} Ub(x) &\le \sup_{u\in[0,x]} \Big\{ -u + \beta \int_{-u}^{\infty} (u + z + \bar{b}) \nu(dz)\Big\} \\ &\le \sup_{u\in[0,x]} \Big\{ -u + \beta u + \beta\bar{b} + \beta \mathbb{E} Z^+\Big\} = \bar{b}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, $Ub(x) \ge 0$ by taking $u := 0$ in (8).

We equip $\mathcal{B}$ with the supremum norm $\|\cdot\|_\infty$. Then, $(\mathcal{B}, \|\cdot\|_\infty)$ is complete. We claim that U defined in (8) is a contraction. With this end in view, let $b, c \in \mathcal{B}$. Since $b \le c + \|b - c\|_\infty$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} Ub(x) - Uc(x) &\le \beta \sup_{u\in[0,x]} \Big\{ -\frac{1}{\gamma} \ln\Big(\int_{-u}^{\infty} e^{-\gamma(u+z+b(u+z))} \nu(dz) + \nu(-\infty, -u)\Big) \\ &\qquad + \frac{1}{\gamma} \ln\Big(\int_{-u}^{\infty} e^{-\gamma(u+z+c(u+z))} \nu(dz) + \nu(-\infty, -u)\Big)\Big\} \\ &\le \beta \sup_{u\in[0,x]} \Big\{ -\frac{1}{\gamma} \ln\Big(\int_{-u}^{\infty} e^{-\gamma(u+z+c(u+z)+\|c-b\|_\infty)} \nu(dz) + e^{-\gamma\|c-b\|_\infty} \nu(-\infty, -u)\Big) \\ &\qquad + \frac{1}{\gamma} \ln\Big(\int_{-u}^{\infty} e^{-\gamma(u+z+c(u+z))} \nu(dz) + \nu(-\infty, -u)\Big)\Big\} \\ &= \beta \|c - b\|_\infty. \end{aligned}$$

Exchanging the roles of b and c we get that $\|Ub - Uc\|_\infty \le \beta\|b - c\|_\infty$.

Next we know by Theorem 1 that $J_k \in \mathcal{S}$, for $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and $J_k = TJ_{k-1}$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence, there exist functions $b_k \in \mathcal{B}$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $J_k(x) = x + b_k(x)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Putting $\mathrm{id}(x) = x$, we obtain for $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$

$$J_k(x) = x + b_k(x) = TJ_{k-1}(x) = T(\mathrm{id} + b_{k-1})(x) = x + Ub_{k-1}(x).$$

This implies that $b_k = Ub_{k-1}$ i.e., the bounded part of the value functions J_k can be iterated with the help of the U-operator. On the other hand, by Banach's fixed point theorem the sequence $(b_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges as $k \to \infty$ to a function $b_o \in \mathcal{B}$, which is the unique fixed point of U. Hence, we infer that $J(x) = x + b_o(x)$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $J \in \mathcal{S}$. Therefore,

$$TJ(x) = T(\mathrm{id} + b_o)(x) = x + Ub_o(x) = x + b_o(x) = J(x)$$

for $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Since $J(x) = 0$ for $x < 0$, we conclude that J is the unique fixed point of T in $\mathcal{S}$.

The existence of $\alpha^* \in \Lambda$ follows from Proposition 2.4.8 in Bäuerle and Rieder (2011). □

Remark 4. The proof of Theorem 2 which essentially hinges on Banach's fixed point theorem shows that the risk sensitive value function can be approximated by sequences of the form

$$J = \lim_{n\to\infty} T^n J_0$$

with $J_0 \in \mathcal{S}$ and not only by the special sequence $T^n\mathbf{0}$ which appears in Lemma 2.

5. Characterising the Value Function J and its Maximiser α^*

In what follows we denote by $\alpha^* \in \Lambda$ the largest maximiser of the right-hand side in the following equation

$$J(x) = \sup_{a\in[0,x]} \Big\{ a - \frac{\beta}{\gamma} \ln\Big(\int_{a-x}^{\infty} e^{-\gamma J(x-a+z)} \nu(dz) + \nu(-\infty, a-x) \Big) \Big\}$$

for $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Since J is continuous it follows from Remark 2.4.9 in Bäuerle and Rieder (2011) that $\alpha^*(x)$ is upper semicontinuous in x. The next lemma contains some properties of J and α^*.

Lemma 4. *a) For all $x \geq y \geq 0$ it holds that $J(x) - J(y) \geq x - y$.*

b) For all $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$ it holds that $J(x - \alpha^*(x)) = J(x) - \alpha^*(x)$ and $\alpha^*(x - \alpha^*(x)) = 0$.

Proof. a) Let $x \geq y \geq 0$. Then by the change of variable $a' := a - x + y$ we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
J(x) &= \sup_{a\in[0,x]} \Big\{ a - \frac{\beta}{\gamma} \ln\Big(\int_{a-x}^{\infty} e^{-\gamma J(x-a+z)} \nu(dz) + \nu(-\infty, a-x) \Big) \Big\} \\
&= \max\Big\{ \sup_{a\in[0,x-y]} \Big\{ a - \frac{\beta}{\gamma} \ln\Big(\int_{a-x}^{\infty} e^{-\gamma J(x-a+z)} \nu(dz) + \nu(-\infty, a-x) \Big) \Big\}, \\
&\qquad \sup_{a\in[x-y,x]} \Big\{ a - \frac{\beta}{\gamma} \ln\Big(\int_{a-x}^{\infty} e^{-\gamma J(x-a+z)} \nu(dz) + \nu(-\infty, a-x) \Big) \Big\} \Big\} \\
&\geq x - y + \sup_{a'\in[0,y]} \Big\{ a' - \frac{\beta}{\gamma} \ln\Big(\int_{a'-y}^{\infty} e^{-\gamma J(y-a'+z)} \nu(dz) + \nu(-\infty, a'-y) \Big) \Big\} \\
&= x - y + J(y)
\end{aligned}$$

and the statement follows.

b) Let $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Then, $x - \alpha^*(x) \geq 0$ and we get by choosing action $a = 0$ that

$$J(x - \alpha^*(x)) \geq -\frac{\beta}{\gamma} \ln \Big(\int_{\alpha^*(x)-x}^{\infty} e^{-\gamma J(x-\alpha^*(x)+z)} \nu(dz) + \nu(-\infty, \alpha^*(x) - x) \Big).$$

On the other hand, by the definition of α^* we obtain

$$J(x) = \alpha^*(x) - \frac{\beta}{\gamma} \ln \Big(\int_{\alpha^*(x)-x}^{\infty} e^{-\gamma J(x-\alpha^*(x)+z)} \nu(dz) + \nu(-\infty, \alpha^*(x) - x) \Big).$$

Thus, we infer

$$\begin{aligned} J(x) - \alpha^*(x) &= -\frac{\beta}{\gamma} \ln \Big(\int_{\alpha^*(x)-x}^{\infty} e^{-\gamma J(x-\alpha^*(x)+z)} \nu(dz) + \nu(-\infty, \alpha^*(x) - x) \Big) \\ &\leq J(x - \alpha^*(x)) \leq J(x) - \alpha^*(x), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from part a) by setting $y = x - \alpha^*(x)$. Hence, we have equality in the last expression and also $\alpha^*(x - \alpha^*(x)) = 0$. This is also the largest maximizer, since $\alpha^*(x)$ is the largest maximizer in state x. □

Next we show that there exists a finite risk reserve level beyond which it is always optimal to pay down to this level.

Lemma 5. *Let* $\xi := \sup\{x \in \mathbb{R}_+ |\ \alpha^*(x) = 0\}$. *Then* $\xi < \infty$ *and*

$$\alpha^*(x) = x - \xi, \quad \text{for all } x \geq \xi.$$

Proof. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$ be such that $\alpha^*(x) = 0$. Then, from Section 2 we know that $J(x) \leq x + \bar{b}$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} J(x) &= -\frac{\beta}{\gamma} \ln \Big(\int_{-x}^{\infty} e^{-\gamma J(x+z)} \nu(dz) + \nu(-\infty, -x) \Big) \\ &\leq -\frac{\beta}{\gamma} \ln \Big(\int_{-x}^{\infty} e^{-\gamma (x+z+\bar{b})} \nu(dz) + e^{-\gamma(x+\bar{b})} \nu(-\infty, -x) \Big) \\ &= \beta x + \beta \bar{b} - \frac{\beta}{\gamma} \ln \Big(\int_{-x}^{\infty} e^{-\gamma z} \nu(dz) + \nu(-\infty, -x) \Big) \\ &\leq \beta x + \beta \bar{b} - \frac{\beta}{\gamma} \ln \Big(\int_{0}^{\infty} e^{-\gamma z} \nu(dz) + \nu(-\infty, 0) \Big) \\ &\leq \beta x + \beta \bar{b} + \beta \int_0^{\infty} z \nu(dz) = \beta x + \bar{b}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, $J(x) \geq x$. Taking into account these two inequalities we get

$$x \leq \frac{\bar{b}}{1 - \beta} < \infty,$$

and ξ has to be finite.

Now let $x \geq \xi$. We know from Lemma 4b that $\alpha^*(x-\alpha^*(x)) = 0$, hence $x-\alpha^*(x) \leq \xi$. Thus a payment of $\alpha^*(x) - (x-\xi)$ is admissible in state ξ and we infer

$$\begin{aligned} J(\xi) &\geq \alpha^*(x) - (x-\xi) - \frac{\beta}{\gamma} \ln\Big(\int_{\alpha^*(x)-x}^{\infty} e^{-\gamma J(x-\alpha^*(x)+z)} \nu(dz) + \nu(-\infty, \alpha^*(x)-x)\Big) \\ &= J(x) - (x-\xi) \geq J(\xi). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have equality and $\alpha^*(x) - (x-\xi)$ is a maximum point in state ξ. Since $\alpha^*(\xi)$ is the largest maximum point we obtain

$$0 = \alpha^*(\xi) \geq \alpha^*(x) - (x-\xi) \geq 0,$$

which implies that $\alpha^*(x) = x - \xi$. □

Next we will further characterise α^* on the interval $[0, \xi]$. It turns out that $\alpha^{*\infty} \in \Pi^S$ is a so-called *band policy*.

Definition 1. a) A stationary policy α^∞ is called a *barrier policy*, if there exists a number $c \geq 0$ such that

$$\alpha(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } x \leq c \\ x - c, & \text{if } x > c. \end{cases}$$

b) A stationary policy α^∞ is called a *(finite) band policy*, if there exist finitely many numbers $0 \leq c_0 < d_1 \leq c_1 < d_2 \leq \ldots < c_m$ such that

$$\alpha(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } x \leq c_0 \\ x - c_k, & \text{if } c_k < x \leq d_{k+1} \\ 0, & \text{if } d_{k+1} < x \leq c_{k+1} \\ x - c_m, & \text{if } x > c_m, \end{cases} \qquad k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

c) A stationary policy α^∞ is called a *(countable) band policy*, if there exists a partition of $\mathbb{R}_+$ of the form $A \cup B = \mathbb{R}_+$ with

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & , \text{ if } x \in B \\ x - z, \text{ where } z = \sup\{y \mid y \in B, 0 \leq y < x\} & , \text{ if } x \in A \end{cases}$$

Note that a barrier policy is a special finite band policy and a finite band policy is a special countable band policy. In what follows the term 'band-policy' refers to the most general definition in part c).

Theorem 3. *The stationary policy $\alpha^{*\infty}$ is a band policy.*

PROOF. We only have to consider the interval $[0,\xi)$, since α^* is given on $[\xi,\infty)$ by Lemma 5. Let us introduce the function $\Gamma : \mathbb{R}_+ \mapsto \mathbb{R}$

$$\Gamma(x) := -\frac{\beta}{\gamma} \ln\Big(\int_{-x}^{\infty} e^{-\gamma J(x+z)} \nu(dz) + \nu(-\infty,-x)\Big).$$

Next observe that for $0 \le y < x \le \xi$ by Lemma 4a, we have

$$J(x) = \sup_{a\in[0,x]} \{a + \Gamma(x-a)\} \ge x - y + \sup_{a\in[0,y]} \{a + \Gamma(y-a)\} = x - y + J(y). \tag{9}$$

In particular, if $\alpha^*(x) \ge x - y$, then the action $\alpha^*(x) - x + y \ge 0$ is available in y. Therefore, from (9) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} J(x) &= \alpha^*(x) + \Gamma(x - \alpha^*(x)) \ge x - y + \alpha^*(y) + \Gamma(y - \alpha^*(y)) = J(y) + x - y \\ &\ge x - y + \alpha^*(x) - x + y + \Gamma(y - (\alpha^*(x) - x + y)) = J(x). \end{aligned}$$

This implies that all inequalities in the above display become equalities. Since $\alpha^*(y)$ is the largest maximiser in y, then $\alpha^*(y) \ge \alpha^*(x) - x + y$. Assume that $\alpha^*(y) > \alpha^*(x) - x + y$. Then, for the action $\alpha^*(y) + x - y$, available in state x, we obtain

$$J(x) = \alpha^*(x) + \Gamma(x - \alpha^*(x)) > x - y + \alpha^*(y) + \Gamma(x - (x - y + \alpha^*(y))) = x - y + J(y) = J(x).$$

Hence, $\alpha^*(x) = \alpha^*(y) + x - y$. This fact can be used to construct the bands as follows: Let $\alpha^*(x') := \sup_{0\le x\le \xi} \alpha^*(x)$. The maximal value is attained since α^* is upper semicontinuous. If $\alpha^*(x') = 0$ we are done. Now suppose that $\alpha^*(x') > 0$. Consider the interval $[x' - \alpha^*(x'), x']$. We have $\alpha^*(x' - \alpha^*(x')) = 0$ and it holds for $x \in [x' - \alpha^*(x'), x']$ that $\alpha^*(x') = \alpha^*(x) + x' - x$. Rewriting this equation as $\alpha^*(x) = x - (x' - \alpha^*(x'))$ shows that we have constructed one band of the band policy. Then we look for the next highest value on the remaining set $[0,\xi] \setminus [x' - \alpha^*(x'), x']$. This procedure is carried on until all bands are constructed. Since every such interval contains at least one rational number and the intervals are disjoint, there are at most a countable number of them. □

6. Optimality of α^*

In this section, we finally show that the stationary policy $\alpha^{*\infty}$ is optimal in the infinite time horizon model.

Theorem 4. *The policy $\alpha^{*\infty} \in \Pi^S$ is optimal.*

PROOF. Let $\alpha \in \Lambda$ and $v \in \mathcal{S}$. Then, by (3) for some constant $c \in \mathbb{R}_+$ it holds $L_\alpha(v+c) \le \beta c + L_\alpha v$, and by induction it follows that $L_\alpha^n(v+c) \le \beta^n c + L_\alpha^n v$, where L_α^n is the n-th composition of the operator L_α with itself. Additionally, for α^* we have

$$L_{\alpha^*}\mathbf{0}(x) = \alpha^*(x) \ge (x - \xi)^+ =: p_\xi(x).$$

Let $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Recalling that $\mathrm{id}(x) = x$ and making use of Theorem 2 we infer that

$$\begin{aligned} J(x) &= L^n_{\alpha^*} J(x) \le L^n_{\alpha^*}(\mathrm{id} + \bar{b})(x) \le L^n_{\alpha^*}(p_\xi + \xi + \bar{b})(x) \\ &\le \beta^n(\xi + \bar{b}) + L^n_{\alpha^*} p_\xi(x) \le \beta^n(\xi + \bar{b}) + L^{n+1}_{\alpha^*}\mathbf{0}(x). \end{aligned}$$

Letting $n \to \infty$ we obtain $J(x) \le J_{\alpha^*}(x)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$. However, $J_{\alpha^*}(x) \le J(x)$. Hence, $\alpha^{*\infty}$ is optimal. □

Theorem 5. *Suppose that the density g is continuously differentiable on the interior of its support. Then, the value function J is differentiable on $\mathbb{R}_+$ a.e. and $J' \ge 1$ a.e.*

Proof. Recall the structure of the band policy and denote by $I_k = (c_k, d_{k+1})$ the open interval of points, where $\alpha^*(x) = x - c_k$. From the fixed point equation we obtain for $x \in I_k$

$$J(x) = x - c_k - \frac{\beta}{\gamma} \ln\Big(\int_{-c_k}^{\infty} e^{-\gamma J(c_k + z)} \nu(dz) + \nu(-\infty, -c_k) \Big)$$

and then $J(x)$ is obviously differentiable with derivative $J'(x) = 1$. Next let $B := \{x \in \mathbb{R}_+ : \alpha^*(x) = 0\}$ and take an interior point $x \in B$. We have

$$J(x) = -\frac{\beta}{\gamma} \ln\Big(\int_{-x}^{\infty} e^{-\gamma J(x+z)} g(z) dz + \int_{-\infty}^{-x} g(z) dz \Big)$$

and using the change of variables $w := x + z$, it follows that

$$J(x) = -\frac{\beta}{\gamma} \ln\Big(\int_{0}^{\infty} e^{-\gamma J(w)} g(w - x) dw + G(-x) \Big).$$

Hence, we see that due to our assumptions $J'(x)$ exists. The points where J might not be differentiable are the endpoints of the countable number of intervals I_k and thus countable.

The fact that $J'(x) \ge 1$ follows from Lemma 4a. □

7. The Policy Improvement Algorithm

One way to find an optimal dividend policy is to use the Policy Improvement Algorithm, which however has to be defined in the right way. We also impose in this section the following additional assumption

(A3') ν has a density g with respect to the Lebesgue measure which is a.e. continuous.

Let us set $\xi^* := \frac{\bar{b}}{1-\beta}$ and consider a stationary policy α^∞ such that $\alpha(x) \ge x - \xi^*$ for all $x \ge \xi^*$ and $J_\alpha(x) \ge x$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$. This is, for example, true for $\alpha(x) = x$. Then, $J_\alpha(x) = x + \frac{\beta \rho(Z^+)}{1-\beta}$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Now we want to find an improvement of α. For this purpose let us again define

$$\Gamma_\alpha(x) := -\frac{\beta}{\gamma} \ln\Big(\int_{-x}^{\infty} e^{-\gamma J_\alpha(x+z)} \nu(dz) + \nu(-\infty, -x) \Big) \tag{10}$$

and denote by $\delta(x)$ the largest maximiser of

$$a \mapsto a + \Gamma_\alpha(x - a)$$

on the interval $[0, x]$. Note that such a maximiser exists by Proposition 2.4.8 in Bäuerle and Rieder (2011). Then, it is possible to show that δ has the following properties.

Theorem 6. *The new decision rule δ has the following properties:*

a) $\delta(x - \delta(x)) = 0$ *for all* $x \in \mathbb{R}$,

b) $\delta(x) \geq x - \xi^*$ *for all* $x > \xi^*$,

c) $x \leq J_\alpha(x) \leq J_\delta(x) \leq x + \bar{b}$ *for all* x.

PROOF. a) The statement is true for if $\delta(x) = 0$ or $\delta(x) = x$. Suppose now that $0 < \delta(x) < x$ and, on the contrary, assume that $\delta(x - \delta(x)) > 0$. Thus, there exists an $a_0 \in (0, x - \delta(x)]$ such that

$$a_0 + \Gamma_\alpha(x - \delta(x) - a_0) \geq \Gamma_\alpha(x - \delta(x)).$$

Since, δ is the largest maximiser, we have for all $a > \delta(x)$ that

$$a + \Gamma_\alpha(x - a) < \delta(x) + \Gamma_\alpha(x - \delta(x)).$$

Note that $x - \delta(x) - a_0 \geq 0$. Combining these two inequalities we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(x) + \Gamma_\alpha(x - \delta(x)) &> \delta(x) + a_0 + \Gamma_\alpha(x - \delta(x) - a_0) \\ &\geq \delta(x) + \Gamma_\alpha(x - \delta(x)). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\delta(x - \delta(x)) = 0$.

b) We show first that for $x > \xi^*$ we have $\delta(x) > 0$. Consider $a = \alpha(x)$. Here we obtain

$$\alpha(x) + \Gamma_\alpha(x - \alpha(x)) = J_\alpha(x) \geq x.$$

For $a = 0$ we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_\alpha(x) &= -\frac{\beta}{\gamma} \ln\Big(\int_{-x}^{\infty} e^{-\gamma J_\alpha(x+z)} \nu(dz) + \nu(-\infty, -x) \Big) \\ &\leq -\frac{\beta}{\gamma} \ln\Big(\int_{-x}^{\infty} e^{-\gamma(x+z+\bar{b})} \nu(dz) + e^{-\gamma(x+\bar{b})} \nu(-\infty, -x) \Big) \\ &= \beta(x + \bar{b}) - \frac{\beta}{\gamma} \ln\Big(\int_{-x}^{\infty} e^{-\gamma z} \nu(dz) + \nu(-\infty, -x) \Big) \\ &\leq \beta(x + \bar{b}) + \beta \int_0^{\infty} z \nu(dz) = \beta x + \bar{b}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence for $\delta(x) = 0$ we necessarily must have that $\beta x + \bar{b} \geq x$ which is the case if and only if $x \leq \frac{\bar{b}}{1-\beta} = \xi^*$. Thus, for $x > \xi^*$ we must have $\delta(x) > 0$. Together with part a) it follows that $\delta(x) \geq x - \xi^*$.

c) By definition of δ we obtain $J_\alpha(x) \le L_\delta J_\alpha(x)$ and by iteration we get

$$\begin{aligned} J_\alpha(x) &\le L_\delta^n J_\alpha(x) \le L_\delta^n(\mathrm{id} + \bar{b})(x) \le L_\delta^n(p_{\xi^*} + \xi^* + \bar{b})(x) \\ &\le \beta^n(\xi^* + \bar{b}) + L_\delta^n p_{\xi^*}(x) \le \beta^n(\xi^* + \bar{b}) + L_\delta^{n+1}\mathbf{0}(x), \end{aligned}$$

where $p_{\xi^*}(x) = (x - \xi^*)^+$. Letting $n \to \infty$ the first term on the right-hand side converges to zero and the second term converges to J_δ. This implies $x \le J_\alpha(x) \le J_\delta(x) \le x + \bar{b}$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$. □

After executing one policy improvement step we obtain a decision rule δ with a better value J_δ. Repeating this procedure we can further improve the value. In case the improvement step returns the same decision rule, it is optimal. Otherwise we obtain an increasing sequence of value functions which converge against the optimal one.

Theorem 7. *a) If $\delta = \alpha$ in the algorithm we have $J_\alpha = J$, i.e., the stationary policy α^∞ is optimal.*

b) In case the algorithm does not stop, it generates a sequence of decision rules (δ_k) with $\lim_{k\to\infty} J_{\delta_k} = J$.

Proof. Before we start with the main part of the proof, the following observation in crucial. When we replace the set $\mathcal{S}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}' := \{v : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+ |\ & x \le v(x) \le x + \bar{b} \text{ for } x \in \mathbb{R}_+, \\ & v(x) = 0 \text{ for } x < 0,\ v \text{ is measurable } \mathbb{R}_+\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then again $T : \mathcal{S}' \to \mathcal{S}'$. This is true since for $v \in \mathcal{S}'$ we still have

$$(x, a) \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-\gamma v(x-a+z)} g(z) dz$$

is continuous. This can be seen as follows: Changing variables we get the function

$$(x, a) \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-\gamma v(w)} g(w - x + a) dw.$$

Assume that $x_n \to x$ and $a_n \to a$. Hence,

$$\Big| \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-\gamma v(w)} g(w - x_n + a_n) dw - \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-\gamma v(w)} g(w - x + a) dw \Big| \le$$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} |e^{-\gamma v(w)}| |g(w - x_n + a_n) - g(w - x + a)| dw \le$$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} |g(w - x_n + a_n) - g(w - x + a)| dw \to 0.$$

The last convergence follows from the Scheffe Theorem, since by assumption $g(w - x_n + a_n) \to g(w - x + a)$ for almost all $w \in \mathbb{R}$. Also in Theorem 2 we can replace $\mathcal{B}$ by

$$\mathcal{B}' := \{b : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+ |\ b(x) \leq \bar{b}, b \text{ is measurable on } \mathbb{R}_+\}.$$

In total, we obtain that under the additional assumption (A3'), T has a unique fixed point on $\mathcal{S}'$ which is J.

a) If the algorithm returns α we have $TJ_\alpha = L_\delta J_\alpha = L_\alpha J_\alpha = J_\alpha$ and $J_\alpha \in \mathcal{S}'$. Since J is the unique fixed point of T in $\mathcal{S}'$ we obtain $J = J_\alpha$ and the statement follows.

b) From Theorem 6c we know that J_{δ_k} is increasing in k and thus the limit $\lim_{k\to\infty} J_{\delta_k} = \bar{J}$ exists and $\bar{J} \in \mathcal{S}'$. Since $J_{\delta_k} \leq J$ we have $\bar{J} \leq J$. From the definition of δ_k and Lemma 3 we have

$$J_{\delta_{k+1}} = L_{\delta_{k+1}} J_{\delta_{k+1}} \geq L_{\delta_{k+1}} J_{\delta_k} = TJ_{\delta_k} \geq L_{\delta_k} J_{\delta_k} = J_{\delta_k}.$$

Taking the limit $k \to \infty$ we obtain with Theorem A.1.6 in Bäuerle and Rieder (2011) that $\bar{J} = T\bar{J}$. From our previous discussion it follows that $\bar{J} = J$. □

8. The Infinite Time Horizon Model: Case Study

This section deals with a dividend payout model, in which the increments have the following exponential probability density function

$$g(x) = \begin{cases} \lambda e^{\lambda(x-d)}, & x \leq d \\ 0, & x > d. \end{cases} \tag{11}$$

Then $G(x) = e^{\lambda(x-d)}$ for $x \leq d$, and $G(x) = 1$ for $x > d$ is the cumulative distribution. Clearly, the mean of Z which has the density in (11) is $d - 1/\lambda$. We should have $\lambda d > 1$.

From Theorem 2 it follows that there exists a function $J \in \mathcal{S}$ such that

$$J(x) = \sup_{a\in[0,x]} \left\{ a - \frac{\beta}{\gamma} \ln \left(\int_{a-x}^{d} e^{-\gamma J(x-a+z)} g(z)dz + G(a-x) \right) \right\}.$$

Simple re-arrangements and the substitution $u := x - a$ give

$$J(x) = x + \sup_{u\in[0,x]} \left\{ -u - \frac{\beta}{\gamma} \ln \left(\int_{0}^{d+u} e^{-\gamma J(y)} g(y-u)dy + G(-u) \right) \right\}.$$

Proceeding along similar lines as in Socha (2014) we are able to show that in the risk averse setting the optimal policy is of a barrier type. With this end in view we set

$$h(u) := -u - \frac{\beta}{\gamma} \ln \left(\int_{0}^{d+u} e^{-\gamma J(y)} g(y-u)dy + G(-u) \right).$$

Since $J(x) \leq x + \bar{b}$ for every $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$, then it is easy to infer that $h(u) \to -\infty$ when $u \to \infty$. Moreover, from the form of function h it follows that it is differentiable on $(0, \infty)$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} h'(u) &= -1 + \frac{\beta}{\gamma}\left(\frac{\int_0^{d+u} e^{-\gamma J(y)}\lambda^2 e^{\lambda(y-u-d)}dy - \lambda e^{-\gamma J(d+u)} + \lambda G(-u)}{\int_0^{d+u} e^{-\gamma J(y)}\lambda e^{\lambda(y-u-d)}dy + G(-u)}\right) \\ &= -1 + \frac{\beta\lambda}{\gamma}\left(1 - \frac{e^{-\gamma J(d+u)}}{\int_0^{d+u} e^{-\gamma J(y)}\lambda e^{\lambda(y-u-d)}dy + G(-u)}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Suppose first that $\frac{\gamma}{\beta\lambda} < 1$. Now, we may have either $h'(0^+) > 0$ or $h'(0^+) \leq 0$.

- Assume first that $h'(0^+) > 0$, i.e.,

$$-1 + \frac{\beta\lambda}{\gamma}\left(\frac{e^{-\gamma J(0)/\beta} - e^{-\gamma J(d)}}{e^{-\gamma J(0)/\beta}}\right) > 0.$$

Let $p > 0$ be the first point at which h has a local maximum, that is, $h'(p) = 0$. Observe that

$$J(p) = -\frac{\beta}{\gamma}\ln\left(\int_0^{d+p} e^{-\gamma J(y)}g(y-p)dy + G(-p)\right).$$

Making use of these two facts we find that

$$h'(p) = 0 = -1 + \frac{\beta\lambda}{\gamma}\left(\frac{e^{-\gamma J(p)/\beta} - e^{-\gamma J(d+p)}}{e^{-\gamma J(p)/\beta}}\right),$$

which is equivalent to the equality

$$\ln\left(1 - \frac{\gamma}{\beta\lambda}\right) + \gamma J(d+p) = \frac{\gamma J(p)}{\beta}.$$

Moreover, from Lemma 4a, we know that $J(d+p) - J(p) \geq d$. Hence, it must hold

$$J(p) \geq \frac{\frac{1}{\gamma}\ln\left(1 - \frac{\gamma}{\beta\lambda}\right) + d}{1/\beta - 1}. \tag{12}$$

On the contrary, assume that there exists $q > p$ at which h has a global maximum. Therefore, for x lying in the left neighborhood of q we have

$$J(x) = -\frac{\beta}{\gamma}\ln\left(\int_0^{d+x} e^{-\gamma J(y)}g(y-x)dy + G(-x)\right) \tag{13}$$

and, consequently,

$$J'(x) = \frac{\beta\lambda}{\gamma}\left(\frac{e^{-\gamma J(x)/\beta} - e^{-\gamma J(d+x)}}{e^{-\gamma J(x)/\beta}}\right). \tag{14}$$

Obviously, we may take such $x \le q$ for which $x + d \ge q$. Then, making use of (13) with $x := q$ and the fact that q is the global maximum point we have

$$J(x + d) = x + d - q + J(q).$$

Since $J'(q) = 1$ we infer from (14) that

$$J'(q) = 1 = \frac{\beta\lambda}{\gamma} \left(\frac{e^{-\gamma J(q)/\beta} - e^{-\gamma(d+J(q))}}{e^{-\gamma J(q)/\beta}} \right).$$

Thus,

$$J(q) = \frac{\frac{1}{\gamma} \ln\left(1 - \frac{\gamma}{\beta\lambda}\right) + d}{1/\beta - 1}.$$

However, this equality, (12) and Lemma 4a yield that $J(p) + q - p \le J(q) \le J(p)$, which leads to $q \le p$. Hence, p must be the global maximum point of the function h. In this case the optimal policy is of a barrier type:

$$\alpha^*(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & x \le p \\ x - p, & x > p. \end{cases}$$

- Let us now assume that $h'(0^+) \le 0$, i.e.,

$$-1 + \frac{\beta\lambda}{\gamma} \left(\frac{e^{-\gamma J(0)/\beta} - e^{-\gamma J(d)}}{e^{-\gamma J(0)/\beta}} \right) \le 0.$$

This means that

$$\frac{\gamma J(0)}{\beta} \ge \ln\left(1 - \frac{\gamma}{\beta\lambda}\right) + J(d).$$

Making use of Lemma 4a, we obtain the necessary condition for $h'(0^+) \le 0$:

$$J(0) \ge \frac{d + \frac{1}{\gamma} \ln\left(1 - \frac{\gamma}{\beta\lambda}\right)}{1/\beta - 1}. \tag{15}$$

Assume that p is the global maximum point of the function h. Hence, for $x < p$ (sufficiently close to p) (13) and (14) hold true. Clearly, we may consider $x < p$ such that $x + d > p$. Then, $J(x) = x - p + J(p)$ for $x \ge p$. Combining this equality with (14) we get

$$J'(x) = \frac{\beta\lambda}{\gamma} \left(\frac{e^{-\gamma J(x)/\beta} - e^{-\gamma(x+d-p+J(p))}}{e^{-\gamma J(x)/\beta}} \right). \tag{16}$$

Letting $x \to p^-$, applying that $J'(p) = 1$ and (15) we infer

$$J(p) = \frac{d + \frac{1}{\gamma} \ln\left(1 - \frac{\gamma}{\beta\lambda}\right)}{1/\beta - 1} \le J(0).$$

However, by Lemma 4a it follows that $J(0) \geq J(p) \geq p + J(0)$ Therefore, the global maximum of the function h must be at $u = 0$. In this case the optimal policy is $\alpha^*(x) = x$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$.

Consider now the case $\frac{\gamma}{\beta\lambda} \geq 1$. Inspecting the derivative of h we see that $h'(u) = -1 + \frac{\beta\lambda}{\gamma}(1 - f(u))$ where $f > 0$. Hence, $h'(u) < 0$ for all $u \geq 0$ and its maximum is attained at $u = 0$. Hence, the optimal policy is $\alpha^*(x) = x$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$.

9. Influence of the Risk Sensitivity Parameter

In this section, we discuss the influence of the risk coefficient γ on the optimal policy in the model with the finite time horizon (three stages). We compute the value function with the help of Theorem 1. When there is only one payment, we obviously have $J_1(x) = x$ independent of γ. Now consider J_2. We obtain by the transformation $u := x - a$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and by plugging in the density g that

$$\begin{aligned} J_2(x) &= \sup_{a\in[0,x]} \left\{ a - \frac{\beta}{\gamma} \ln\Big(\int_{a-x}^{\infty} e^{-\gamma(x-a+z)} \nu(dz) + \nu(-\infty, a-x) \Big) \right\} \\ &= x + \sup_{u\in[0,x]} \left\{ -u - \frac{\beta}{\gamma} \ln\Big(e^{-\gamma u} \int_{-u}^{\infty} e^{-\gamma z} g(z)dz + \int_{-\infty}^{-u} g(z)dz \Big) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

With a little abuse of notation define the function h, which has to be maximised

$$h(u) := -u - \frac{\beta}{\gamma} \ln\Big(e^{-\gamma u} \int_{-u}^{\infty} e^{-\gamma z} g(z)dz + \int_{-\infty}^{-u} g(z)dz \Big).$$

In order to look for the maximum we differentiate this function and obtain

$$h'(u) = -1 + \beta \frac{e^{-\gamma u} \int_{-u}^{\infty} e^{-\gamma z} g(z)dz}{e^{-\gamma u} \int_{-u}^{\infty} e^{-\gamma z} g(z)dz + \int_{-\infty}^{-u} g(z)dz}.$$

Since $\beta < 1$ and the density is non-negative, it is easy to see that $h'(u) < 0$ for all $u \geq 0$, which means that h is decreasing and the maximum is attained at $u = 0$. Being aware of the transformation we obtain $\alpha_2^*(x) = x$, i.e., the optimal decision rule is to pay out everything at the beginning of a planning horizon of length two, independent of γ. Hence, we conclude that

$$J_2(x) = x - \frac{\beta}{\gamma} \ln\Big(\int_0^{\infty} e^{-\gamma z} g(z)dz + \int_{-\infty}^{0} g(z)dz \Big) = x + \beta\rho(Z^+). \tag{17}$$

In particular, in the risk neutral case we get $J_2(x) = x + \beta\mathbb{E}Z^+$.

Next we consider J_3. Making use of (17) and of the same transformation as before we get

$$\begin{aligned} J_3(x) &= \sup_{a\in[0,x]} \Big\{ a - \frac{\beta}{\gamma} \ln\Big(\int_{a-x}^{\infty} e^{-\gamma(x-a+z+\beta\rho(Z^+))} \nu(dz) + \nu(-\infty, a-x) \Big) \Big\} \\ &= x + \sup_{u\in[0,x]} \Big\{ -u - \frac{\beta}{\gamma} \ln\Big(e^{-\gamma(u+\beta\rho(Z^+))} \int_{-u}^{\infty} e^{-\gamma z} g(z)dz + \int_{-\infty}^{-u} g(z)dz \Big) \Big\}. \end{aligned}$$



Figure 1: The barrier as a function of γ. The left-hand side with $\mu = 1.2$. The right-hand side with $\mu = 2$.

We define, again abusing the notation, the function h as follows

$$h(u) := -u - \frac{\beta}{\gamma} \ln \Big(e^{-\gamma(u+\beta\rho(Z^+))} \int_{-u}^{\infty} e^{-\gamma z} g(z) dz + \int_{-\infty}^{-u} g(z) dz \Big).$$

Differentiating h yields

$$h'(u) = -1 + \beta \Big(1 - \frac{\int_{-\infty}^{-u} g(z) dz + \frac{1}{\gamma}(1 - e^{-\gamma\beta\rho(Z^+)}) g(-u)}{e^{-\gamma(u+\beta\rho(Z^+))} \int_{-u}^{\infty} e^{-\gamma z} g(z) dz + \int_{-\infty}^{-u} g(z) dz} \Big).$$

In case of the risk neutral setting ($\gamma \to 0^+$) the expression is given by

$$h'(u) = -1 + \beta \int_{-u}^{\infty} g(z) dz + \beta^2 \mathbb{E} Z^+ g(-u).$$

Here it is easy to see by inspection of h'' that h' is decreasing, if the density g is increasing and log-concave on $(-\infty, 0)$ and $\frac{g(0)}{g'(0)} \leq \beta \mathbb{E} Z^+$. Now if h' is decreasing we can either have $h'(0) \leq 0$ in which case $h'(u) \leq 0$ for all u and the maximum point is again $u = 0$ or $h'(0) > 0$, in which case h is first increasing on an interval $[0, q)$ and then decreasing on (q, ∞). Hence, q is the maximum point of h and the optimal dividend payout is a barrier with size q.

Example 1. Since the risk sensitive case is not so easy to discuss in general, we consider a specific example for the density, namely the so-called *double-exponential* with mean μ, i.e.,

$$g(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} e^{-(\mu - x)}, & x \leq \mu \\ \frac{1}{2} e^{-(x - \mu)}, & x > \mu \end{cases}$$



Figure 2: The barrier as a function of γ. The left-hand side with $\mu = 5$. The right-hand side with $\mu = 8$.

We have set $\beta = 0.99$ in all calculations. In Figures 1 and 2 we have plotted the barrier as a function of γ for different μ. For $\gamma \to 0^+$ we obtain the risk neutral situation. The behaviour of this barrier is intriguing. It is very sensitive to the chosen parameter μ, which is the mean of Z. It is worthy to notice that the variance and further central moments are constant and independent of μ. Therefore, we shall discuss the evolution of the curve when the expectation μ of Z is increasing. For small values of μ we can see that the barrier is decreasing, when γ is increasing, i.e., more risk averse shareholders prefer earlier payments. This may be due to the fear of an early ruin. However, if the expectation μ is larger and the company has a good probability to survive for some time period, the barrier is first increasing, i.e., shareholders prefer later payments, which are then rather regular. But surprisingly this is only true up to a certain level of γ. Beyond that level, the barrier decreases rapidly until it gets zero. This means that very risk averse shareholders prefer to have their money at once. It seems that both payment policies, where either a very high barrier is set in order to produce a regular dividend stream or the money is paid out at once, which has also a low variability are reasonable for risk sensitive shareholders. Obviously from an economic point of view the first policy is more meaningful. Very risk averse shareholders seem to be bad for a company.

Example 2. Let us now consider the distribution defined in (11). This distribution has the mean equal to $d-1/\lambda$ and the variance equal to $1/\lambda^2$. We can see that both the first and second moments play a crucial role in determining the barrier. In Figure 3 the variances of Z are the same, but the means are different. It can be seen that the shareholders in case of larger expectation of Z are willing to get payments at once. If they are more risk averse than the barrier starts increasing. If the mean of Z is smaller (the second picture



Figure 3: The barrier as a function of γ, if $\lambda = 6$. The left-hand side with $d = 1.1$. The right-hand side with $d = 0.5$.



Figure 4: The barrier as a function of γ, if $d = 0.5$. The left-hand side with $\lambda = 4.5$. The right-hand side with $\lambda = 4.2$.

in Figure 3), then the barrier increases at once together with the values of risk coefficient. Hence, if the shareholders expect that the risk reverse is stable, in the sense that the company will not be ruined so fast, they wish to have payments at once. Otherwise, they prefer to wait until the risk reserve attains some critical value. However, the more risk averse shareholders wish to wait longer for their dividends. This behaviour is in contrast to the case, when the mean of Z is rather small, but the variance of Z is larger. Figure 4 shows that the barrier decreases, either at once or at a certain point, when the decision maker becomes more risk averse. This means that the risk neutral shareholders or not too much risk averse shareholders prefer to wait for the payments until some critical point. If, on the other hand, they are very risk averse, then they wish to have their dividends at once.

Acknowledgement. We thank both reviewers for careful reading of the manuscript and their comments that improved the presentation of the paper.

References

Albrecher, H., N. Bäuerle, S. Thonhauser, Optimal dividend-payout in random discrete time. Stat. Risk Model. 28 (2011), 251-276.

Albrecher, H., S. Thonhauser, Optimality results for dividend problems in insurance. RACSAM, Rev. R. Acad. Cienc. Exactas Fís. Nat., Ser. A Mat. 103 (2009), 295-320.

Anderson, E.W., The dynamics of risk-sensitive allocations, J. Econ. Theory 125 (2005), 93-150.

Avanzi, B., Strategies for dividend distribution: A review. North Am. Actuar. J. 13 (2009), 217-251.

Bäuerle, N., A. Jaśkiewicz, Risk sensitive dividend problems. Europ. J. Opers. Res. 242(1) (2015), 161-171.

Bäuerle, N., U. Rieder, Markov Decision Processes with Applications to Finance. Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, 2011.

Bäuerle, N., U. Rieder, More risk-sensitive Markov Decision Processes. Math. Oper. Research 39(1) (2014), 105-120.

Borch, K., Optimal strategies in a game of economic survival. Nav. Res. Logist. 29(1) (1982), 19-27.

de Finetti, B., Su un' impostazione alternativa dell teoria collettiva del rischio. Transactions of the XVth congress of actuaries II (1957), 433–443.

Epstein, L.G., S.E. Zin, Substitution, Risk Aversion, and the Temporal Behavior of Consumption and Asset Returns: a theoretical framework. Econometrica, 57(4) (1989), 937-969.

Föllmer, H., A. Schied, Stochastic Finance, An Introduction in Discrete Time. De Gruyter, Berlin, 2004.

Gerber, H.U., Entscheidungskriterien fuer den zusammengesetzten Poisson-Prozess. Schweiz. Aktuarver. Mitt. 1 (1969), 185–227.

Gerber, H.U., On additive premium calculation principles. Astin Bull. 7(3) (1974), 215-222.

Gerber, H.U., E.S.W. Shiu, Optimal dividends: analysis with Brownian motion. North Am. Actuar. J. 8 (2004), 1-20.

Grandits, P., F. Hubalek, W. Schachermayer, M. Žigo, Optimal expected exponential utility of dividend payments in Brownian risk model. Scand. Actuar. J. 2 (2007), 73-107.

Hansen, L.P.,T.J. Sargent, Discounted linear exponential quadratic Gaussian control. IEEE Trans. Automat. Control 40 (1995), pp. 968-971.

Kreps, D.M., E.L. Porteus, E.L., Temporal Resolution of Uncertainty and Dynamic Choice Theory. Econometrica 46(1) (1978), 185-200.

Miyasawa, K., An economic survival game. Oper. Res. Soc. Jap. 4 (1962), 95-113.

Morrill, J.E., One-person game of economic survival. Nav. Res. Logist. 13 (1966), 49-69.

Müller, A., Certainty equivalents as risk measures. Brazilian J. Probab. Stat. 21 (2007) 1-12.

Ozaki, H., A.P. Streufert, Dynamic programming for non-additive stochastic objectives. J. Math. Econ. 25 (1996), 391-442.

Ruszczyński, A., Risk-averse dynamic programming for Markov decision processes. Math. Programming (2010), 1?27.

Shen, Y., W. Stannat, K. Obermayer, Risk-sensitive Markov control processes. SIAM J. Control Optim. 51(5) (2013), 3652-3672.

Socha, D., Discrete time optimal dividend problem with constant premium and exponentially distributed claims. Appl. Math. (Warsaw) 41(1) (2015), 13-31.

Tallarini,T.D., Jr., Risk-sensitive real business cycles, J. Mon. Econ. 45 (2000), 507-532.

Weil, P., Nonexpected utility in macroeconomics. Quart. J. Econ. 105 (1990), 29-42.

Weil, P., Precautionary savings and the permanent income hypothesis. Rev. Econ. Stud. 60 (1993), 367-383.